



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the place of the Cupid in such a way as to agreeably fill the space without absorbing the attention of the spectator. Moreover he put five discs of cactus on the side of the angel. What have these to do in this work? They only attract the attention away from the two principal figures. Had he put in another sleeping soldier it would have been far better. All of these things show that Lanson was not a great thinker.

Such mediocrity of thinking is against the principles taught by the Academy. Dalou could have shown Lanson the errors in his work; they were both active in the same epoch and pupils of the same Academy and were taught the same principles. We repeat: Dalou obeyed them because he saw that they are at the root of all the great works of art made anywhere since the Greeks—and so his work is great and unacademic. Lanson disobeyed these laws and his work is mediocre and academic though clever.

The Academy teaches, and rightly so, that a sculptor should reach at least the beauty of nature as manifested in the finest Greek sculpture. It does not teach that he must not go higher or depart from that, at least safe, standard—provided he does not go to ugly exaggeration. So long as he merely *accentuates*—to the limit of Michelangelo if you will—all is well for the Academy; but when he “deforms the form” into ugliness, as did Bandinelli when he tried to beat Michelangelo, and as Rodin did when he tried to rout the Academy, the public in both cases protested, and rightly so. Dalou did not do that. He departed from the elegant, *svelte* Greek forms and drifted toward the plethoric and plump forms of Rubens but not too far. So, if any one is the Michelangelo of modern sculpture, it is Dalou not Rodin, as some have said. Rodin is the Bandinelli of modern sculpture because like his forerunner he exaggerated to ugliness. And every one of their works which are thus tainted with excessive individualism are doomed to be repudiated by the cultured public.

But—to produce one truly clever work of art is already a passport to distinction; to create a great many of them—if the substance is exalting, is even an assurance of immortality. For we are already happy in the presence of a really clever, even though

academic work of art like this one of Lanson's and the others we have discussed in these pages; only we are more happy in the presence of a truly great work of art.

Therefore, to stimulate our artists to still more arduous efforts, in order to allure them to go beyond the merely academic and clever if they can, we point out the difference between the clever and the great. We do this also, so that the public may know the difference and demand of our artists the great works they might create if they were properly inspired and make ready to pay well for them, because great works call for so much more time, travail and often tears.

But if the American people ever expect to take the rank they hope to occupy in the scale of civilization it can only realize that hope by encouraging serious American artists to devote more time and effort to their work. For there is much truth in Carlyle's remark: “Genius is the capacity for taking infinite pains,” and taking pains takes time and time takes money. Hence the American people should pay well at least for its public art of all kinds, even if the result is mediocre and only now and then great. Because most of the art of the past, even of the best of periods, does not rise above the mediocre and clever.

We trust, therefore, that in future the critics of the National Academy, here in New York, or any other American Academy, will not assail the academies but criticize the works of the individual artists who exhibit there. Criticize them for not obeying those universal principles which our American academies—of any real standing—also teach, criticize them either for their weakness in not having been able to carry out those principles or for their foolishness in straying away too far from them—in their over-eager chase after “individuality” thus losing themselves in that hopeless jungle of mere peculiarity or grotesque ugliness.

Maxim: The subject of two works of art being the same, the fundamental difference between an academic, clever work and an unacademic, great work of art, is mainly a difference in the degree of the completeness and profundity of expression—primary, secondary and tertiary expression—manifested by the two works.

## I AM ART

My name is Art:  
In all the ages I have wrought  
The counterpart  
Of beauty that the world has sought.

Through endless time,  
Through joys and heart-breaks, peace and strife,  
My task sublime—  
To guard the deep desires of Life.

And when the years  
Have swept all nations into dust,  
The watchful spheres  
Will find me faithful to my trust.

R. F. Hamill